

# Fulbright Loses Transcript Bid

## U. S. Won't Release Data on Nixon Talks

By ROBERT K. WALSH  
Star Staff Writer

Chairman Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee disclosed today that the State Department has refused his request for general publication of transcripts of Moscow talks between Vice President Nixon and Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

Declaring he was dissatisfied with the department's stand, he demanded a "full and candid explanation" as to why parts of those conversations appeared in a series of articles by Earl Mazo, a member of the New York Herald Tribune Washington Bureau.

"I hope," Senator Fulbright wrote Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, "that I may have a direct answer to the question: Did the Department of State or any officer or employee or agent of the department make available to Mr. Mazo or to any other representatives of the New York Herald Tribune any or all of the Nixon-Khrushchev conversations or any summary thereof?"

This letter was a follow up to Senator Fulbright's protest to the State Department last week that the material had been withheld from the committee itself as well as the general public. He noted that Mr. Mazo is the author of a biography of Vice President Nixon. Senator Fulbright said the Mazo

articles put Mr. Nixon in too favorable a light in his exchange with Khrushchev.

He made public today Mr. Macomber's reply as follows:

"In the absence of the Secretary, I have been asked to reply to your letter of September 17. In that letter you suggested that the transcript of the record of the Vice President's conversation with the Premier Khrushchev might appropriately be released to the press. Except for possible eventual publication under the established procedures of the Historical Office, records of such conversation between high government officials are not normally made public and it is not planned to do so in this instance."

Senator Fulbright replied today in his letter to Mr. Macomber that he was aware of such procedures.

### Asks Full Explanation

"My point is," he declared, "that in this instance portions of the conversations have already been made public and that this creates a set of circumstances different from those which normally prevail."

"My principle concern as I tried to make clear in my letter of September 17, is that the department follow regular procedures in making public documents of historical interest and significance. These should not be published piecemeal through a single newspaper. I hope I may have a full and candid explanation so that the public may be reassured that it is protected from ex parte reporting and interpretation. I must say I do not feel that it has been so protected in this case."